



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,288	12/29/2000	John R. Stefanik	00335	8905

52270 7590 12/18/2006  
POTOMAC PATENT GROUP, PLLC  
P.O. BOX 270  
FREDERICKSBURG, VA 22404

EXAMINER
----------

SHANG, ANNAN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/18/2006	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,288

Applicant(s)

JOHN R. STEFANIK

Examiner

Annan Q. Shang

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-15 and 20-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-15 and 20-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. With respect to claim 20-25, Applicant's arguments filed 05/22/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to amended claims 9-15 and 26-28 applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection discussed below.

With respect to claims 20-21 and 23-24, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thompson et al (6,484,011)** and in view of **Eggen et al (6,388,715)** and further in view of **Kikinis et al (2002/0059597)**, applicant discusses the teachings of the prior arts of record and argues that, "...there is no motivation to modify the annunciator of Thompson et al based on the teachings of Eggen et al because the user of the Thompson et al wireless information presentation device has no device with which it needs to be in close proximity to for the purpose of receiving feedback regarding events of interest. That is, Thompson et al. does not suggest any 'events of interest' that would have motivated this change..." that "...combining the system of Thompson et al and Eggen et al does not create a remote controller..." (see page labeled 9+ of Applicant's Remarks).

In response, Examiner disagrees. Examiner notes applicant's arguments, however, Thompson discloses a wireless information presentation device (Annunciator 'A' 10) or remote controller that is used in conjunction with interactive applications running on a STB, TV or PC where the A-10 displays guide information, such as events, products, services, gaming, shopping, etc., and can be used for all interactive services

Art Unit: 2623

(col.3, line 14-col.4, line 10), Thompson is silent to teaching features such as the remote controller receiving data that indicates the occurrence of a scheduled event and providing alert to a user when a scheduled event occurs. However, in the same field of endeavor, i.e., a remote control device(s), these deficiencies are disclosed in the teaching of Eggen and Kikinis, where Eggen teaches a remote controller that indicates the occurrence of a scheduled event and Kikinis that further teaches a remote controller which provides an alert signal to a user when a scheduled event occurs. Hence combining the teachings of Eggen and Kikinis to the system of Thompson, is proper, would have been within the knowledge of one skilled in the art, meets all the claimed limitations, maintained as discussed below and appropriate motivation was given. For the same reason above, the 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 22 and 25 is proper, meets all the claimed limitations, maintained as discussed below. Furthermore, with respect to applicant's arguments on obviousness, Examiner maintains that, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporate into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this case both references are in the same field of endeavor as discussed above, as such combining the teaching of Eggen and Kikinis with Thompson would be within the knowledge of one of ordinary skilled artisan, and the appropriate motivation was given as discussed below in the office action. Furthermore it appears Applicant's arguments

Art Unit: 2623

are directed against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986)

With respect to claim 9-11, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thompson et al (6,484,011)** in view of **Chang (2004/0168187)**, and in further view of **Eggen et al (6,388,715)** and further in view of **Kikinis et al (2002/0059597)**, and the 103(a) rejection of their dependent claims 12-15, applicant's arguments are moot in view of a new ground(s) of rejection using the same prior arts of records. Thompson further teaches a motion detect circuit 'MDC' 54 and further states that MDC-54 is responsive to various states of the A-10 (col.7, lines 56-57). As to applicant's arguments that, "...one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to arrived at Applicant's claimed combinations..." Examiner maintains for the same reasons given above, one of ordinary skilled artisan, would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Chang, Eggen and Kikinis with Thompson for the various motivations discussed in the office action below.

With respect to claim 28, for the same reasons discussed above, the 103(a) rejection is proper, one of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of **Chang, Eggen, Kikinis and Greenlee (5,274,550)** with the system of **Thompson** for the motivations discussed below in the office action. **This office action is a final.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 20-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thompson et al (6,484,011)** and in view of **Eggen et al (6,388,715)** and further in view of **Kikinis et al (2002/0059597)**.

As to claim 23, note the Thompson et al reference that discloses a non-telephonic, wireless information presentation device, comprising:

The claimed remote control device including "a processor" is met by microprocessor 32 as illustrated in Figure 2. The claimed "a remote control receiver in communication with the processor" is met by IR receiver 34 coupled to microprocessor 32 as illustrated in Figure 2. The claimed "wherein the remote control receiver is for receiving data from an electronic program guide" is met by "[t]he information received from the host device can be in compressed form, can be in the form of drawing commands, such that the software includes instructions for executing the drawing commands by drawing an image on the visual display 14 and/or can be a subset of an electronic program guide for display on the visual display 14 of the Annunciator 10" (col.7, lines 37-43). The claimed "an input device in communication with the processor" is met by keyboard 15 coupled to microprocessor 32 as illustrated in Figure 2. The claimed "an output device

in communication with the processor” is met by LCD 14 and speaker 50 coupled to microprocessor 32 as illustrated in Figure 2. The claimed “a data storage area in communication with the processor” is met by “[a] ROM/RAM 40 is coupled to a bus 42 connected to the microprocessor 32” (col.5, lines 36-67), note that the processor retrieves instruction from ROM/RAM for interpreting received data (col.5, lines 36-63).

Thompson is silent as to the remote controller receiving data that indicates the occurrence of a scheduled event.

However, note the **Eggen** reference that discloses a television receiver. The claimed “produce a customized alert associated with said scheduled event” is met by “[o]ne feature of this embodiment is that the auditive reminder or alert signal, which the receiver produces when a desired television program is about to start, is associated with the program category of the program” (col.4, lines 25-34) by comparing the start times with the data stored in the electronic program guide (col.4, lines 35-52) wherein “receiver further comprises user-operable means for selecting a desired television program to be received when it is broadcast; and means for reproducing the auditive signal which is characteristic of the program category of the selected television program when said television program is about to be broadcast” (col.1, lines 56-63) wherein “[e]xamples of characteristic sounds are: a gong-stroke for news programs; a cheering audience for sports programs; a part of the tune of a James Bond film for movies” (col.1, line 49-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the Thompson with the teaching of Eggen for the purpose

of reminding users of upcoming programs of interest so that the user does not miss desired programming.

Thompson as modified by Eggen, do not teach where the remote control provides the alert to a user when a scheduled event occurs.

However, note the **Kikinis** reference that discloses a method and apparatus for notifying users of interactive functions (scheduled events). The claimed output device produces a alert associated with said scheduled event is met by "[d]isplay 410 may be used to alert a user of an interactive function (scheduled event)... Additionally, or in lieu of display 410, one or more of buttons 415 may flash or change colors to alert a user of an interactive function... It is also possible to incorporate some sort of audio tone or sound clip through a speaker (not shown) to act as a supplement or as a replacement for the methods described above" (Kikinis [0045-0046]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the system of Thompson as modified by Eggen with the teaching of Kikinis for the purpose of providing a user notification regarding events of interest in situations where a user may not be in close proximity to the television system.

As to claim 20, please see rejection of claim 23.

As to claim 21, the claimed "wherein the data include television program starting times" is met by "annunciator 10 can be programmed to display the programming on a number or all the channels over a short time period" (Thompson 6:39-43) wherein EPG data includes start time information as illustrated in Figure 9.

As to claim 24, please see the rejection of claim 23.



Art Unit: 2623

4. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thompson et al, (6,484,011)** in view of **Eggen et al. (6,388,715)** and **Kikinis et al (2002/0059597)**, as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of **Croy et al (6,509,908)**.

As to claims 22, Thompson as modified by Eggen and Kikinis, is silent as to the use of smart cards.

However, note the **Croy** reference that discloses, a personal navigator system, where a remote control device, includes a smart card reader/writer in communication the processor and a reading interface 260 for smart cards (SC) and the like or a plug-in module interface 262 (col.5, lines 35-44) and further teaches a smart card can be used for storing user information (col.6, lines 1-11) where a smart card writer is inherent to the successful storage of information on said smart card.

Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Thompson as modified by Eggen and Kikinis with the teaching of the Croy smart card for the purpose of providing security, profiles, and other additional options to a user and allowing for easy expansion of services/options provided to a user.

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thompson et al (6,484,011)** in view of **Eggen et al (6,388,715)** and **Kikinis et al. (2002/0059597)**, and further in view of **Greenlee (5,274,550)**.

Art Unit: 2623

As to claim 25, Thompson as modified by Eggen and Kikinis teaches all the claimed limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 23 above, but silent as to wherein said processor detects activation of said input device and, responsive thereto, said processor turns off said customized alert.

However, note the **Greenlee** reference that discloses a handheld device (col.2, lines 7-8) for providing alerts to a user (col.2, lines 39-49). The claimed "wherein said processor detects activation of said input device and, responsive thereto, said processor turns off said customized alert" is met by a user may press a key to turn off the alarm before the time the alarm would normally turn off (col.3, lines 35-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the system of Thompson as modified by Eggen and Kikinis with the teaching of Greenlee for the purpose of allowing the user to stop an alarm after they have been alerted in order to avoid disturbing the device user more than necessary.

6. Claims 9-11, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thompson et al (6,484,011)** in view of **Chang (2004/0168187)**, and in further view of **Eggen et al (6,388,715)** and further in view of **Kikinis et al (2002/0059597)**.

As to claim 26, note the **Thompson** reference that discloses a non-telephonic, wireless information presentation device, comprising:

The claimed remote control device including "a processor" is met by microprocessor 32 as illustrated in Figure 2;

The claimed "a remote control receiver in communication with the processor" is met by IR receiver 34 coupled to microprocessor 32 as illustrated in Figure 2;

The claimed "an input device in communication with the processor" is met by keyboard 15 coupled to microprocessor 32 as illustrated in Figure 2, note, the Thompson reference discloses "[i]f desired, back-lighting can be provide for illuminating the visual display 14" (col.7, lines 47-48);

The claimed "a data storage area in communication with the processor" is met by "[a] ROM/RAM 40 is coupled to a bus 42 connected to the microprocessor 32" (col.5, lines 36-67). The claimed "a motion detector in communication with the processor" is met by "[t]urther, if desired, a motion detect circuit 54 can be coupled to the microprocessor 32, as shown" (col.5, line 46-47), where in response to motion detected by the motion detector, the processor retrieves instructions from the storage area and sends a signal to a light source to illuminate a portion of the input device;

The claimed "an output device in communication with the processor" is met by LCD 14 and speaker 50 coupled to microprocessor 32 as illustrated in Figure 2. The claimed "an electronic device" is met by host device (col.7, lines 11-16). The claimed the electronic device including "a receiver for receiving signals from the remote control device" is met by "[i]t will be understood that the host device with which the annunciator 10 communications, either by IR (34,35) or by RF (36,37) to receive or transmit information..." (col.7, lines 11-16). The claimed "an electronic program guide" is met by

Art Unit: 2623

"[t]he information received from the host device can be in compressed form, can be in the form of drawing commands, such that the software includes instructions for executing the drawing commands by drawing an image on the visual display 14 and/or can be a subset of an electronic program guide for display on the visual display 14 of the annunciator 10" (col.7:37-43). The claimed "a transmitter in communication with the electronic program guide, the transmitter for transmitting data from the electronic program guide to the remote control device" is met by the receiver, transmitter, and EPG as discussed above.

Thompson is silent as to the implementation of the back-lighting.

However, note the **Chang** reference discloses a talking remote control with display. The claimed "a light source in communication with the processor" is met by "[t]he microcontroller 46 also controls a light 52 for illuminating the display screen 12 and an IR transmitter 54 for controlling other devices" (Chang [0020]). The claimed "wherein said processor can retrieve instructions from said storage area and then sends a signal to a light source to illuminate a portion of said input device" is met by the Thompson and Chang combination teaching a remote controller with a light source controlled by the microprocessor where the microprocessor retrieves instructions from memory to control remote control functionality (Thompson 5:29-63) including back-light functionality

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Thompson system back-lighting option with the Chang light source in communication with the processor for the purpose of providing a

Art Unit: 2623

user the ability to use remote controller functions in low light conditions and a method to control activation of the light source.

Thompson as modified by Chang is silent as to the remote controller receiving data that indicates the occurrence of a scheduled event and providing an alert.

However, note the **Eggen** reference that discloses a television receiver. The claimed "wherein the output device is for providing an alert to the user" is met by "[o]ne feature of this embodiment is that the auditive reminder or alert signal, which the receiver produces when a desired television program is about to start, is associated with the program category of the program" (col.4, lines 25-34) by comparing the start times with the data stored in the electronic program guide (col.4, lines 35-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the system Thompson as modified by Chang with the Eggen reminder system for the purpose of reminding users of upcoming programs of interest so that the user does not miss desired programming.

Thompson as modified by and Chang and Eggen, do not teach wherein the remote control provides the alert to a user when a scheduled event occurs.

However, note the **Kikinis** reference that discloses a method and apparatus for notifying users of interactive functions (scheduled events). The claimed "wherein the output device is for providing an alert to a user when a scheduled event occurs" is met by "[d]isplay 410 may be used to alert a user of an interactive function (scheduled event)... Additionally, or in lieu of display 410, one or more of buttons 415 may flash or change colors to alert a user of an interactive function... It is also possible to incorporate

Art Unit: 2623

some sort of audio tone or sound clip through a speaker (not shown) to act as a supplement or as a replacement for the methods described above" (Kikinis [0045-0046]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Thompson as modified by Chang and Eggen with the Kikinis remote controller with scheduled event alerts for the purpose of providing a user notification regarding events of interest in situations where a user may not be in close proximity to the television system.

As to claim 9, the claimed "wherein the data include television program starting times" is met by "annunciator 10 can be programmed to display the programming on a number or all the channels over a short time period" (col.6, lines 39-43) wherein EPG data includes start time information as illustrated in Figure 9.

As to claim 10, the claimed "further comprising a telephonic device in communication with the transmitter" is met by "[i]t will be understood that the host device with which the annunciator 10 communicates, either by IR (34, 35) or by RF (36,37), to receive or transmit information, can be a cable decoder box, a satellite decoder box, a telephone company decoder box, a television set or a computer" (col.6, lines 9-13).

As to claim 11, the claimed "where the output device includes at least one of a speaker and a light source" is met by LCD display and speaker 50 (col.5, lines 39-42) and backlighting to illuminate the visual display or sound producing circuitry (col.7, lines 47-50).

As to claim 27, the claimed "retrieve said instructions from said storage area; interpret said data using said instructions; and use said interpreted data to generate, as said alert, one of a plurality of different alerts associated with said scheduled event" is met by the Thompson et al., Eggen et al, and Kikinis et al. combination as discussed above wherein "[a] ROM/RAM 40 is coupled to a bus 42 connected to the microprocessor 32 and the processor retrieves instruction from ROM/RAM for interpreting received data (Thompson 5:36-63) and to produce an alert associated with said scheduled event.

7. Claims 12-15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thompson et al, (6,484,011)** in view of **Chang (2004/0168187)** and further in view of **Eggen et al. (6,388,715)** and further in view of **Kikinis et al (2002/0059597)** as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of **Croy et al (6,509,908)**.

As to claims 12-15, Thompson as modified Chang, Eggen and Kikinis, fail to explicitly teach smart cards.

However **Croy** reference that discloses, a personal navigator system. The claimed "wherein the remote control device further comprises a smart card reader/writer in communication the processor" is met by the remote device 200 can be equipped with a reading interface 260 for smart cards (SC) and the like or a plug-in module interface 262 (Croy 5:35-44) and smart card can be used for storing user information (Croy 6:1-11) wherein a smart card writer is inherent to the successful storage of information on

Art Unit: 2623

said smart card. The claimed "further comprising a smart card" is met by "smart cards can be cards with the standard magnetic stripe or more advanced with built-in memory or computer chip" (Croy 5:37-39). The claimed "wherein the smart card is configured to include information concerning at least one of a user profile, a user history, a favorite show, a favorite channel, a favorite theme, a channel order, a parental control, a pay-per view purchase, and a pay-per-view spending limit" is met by smart card may be used to store personal profiles of the customer (Croy 6:8-11). The claimed "wherein the smart card is configured to include information concerning at least one of a user Internet profile, an e-mail account, an Internet browser bookmark, an account name, an address list, a security feature, and a display format for Internet browsing on a television monitor" is met by "[a]fter reading the smart card, the user may additionally be asked to identify himself/herself through input of a smart card personal identification number (PIN, number, or code) for enabling special services" (Croy 6:12-21) and "smart cards can be used for identification or they can supply a small amount of(e.g., decremented data to enable services e.g. like telephony cards, Also, a conventional money card/cash card may be used to pay for services or load cash onto the card" (Croy 5:46-50).

Therefore, the it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Thompson system as modified by Chang, Eggen and Kikinis with the Croy for the purpose of providing security, profiles, and other additional options to a user and allowing for easy expansion of services/options provided to a user.



8. Claims 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thompson et al (6,484,011)** in view of **Chang (2004/0168187)**, and in further view of **Eggen et al (6,388,715)** and further in view of **Kikinis et al (2002/0059597)**, and further in view of **Greenlee (5,274,550)**.

As to claim 28, the claimed "A system, comprising..." is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 26 above, but **Thompson** as modified by **Chang** and **Eggen et al (6,388,715)** and **Kikinis**, fail to explicitly teach wherein said processor detects activation of said input device and, responsive thereto, said processor turns off said customized alert.

However, note the **Greenlee** reference that discloses a handheld device (col.2, lines 7-8) for providing alerts to a user (col.2, lines 39-49). The claimed "wherein said processor detects activation of said input device and, responsive thereto, said processor turns off said customized alert" is met by a user may press a key to turn off the alarm before the time the alarm would normally turn off (col.3, lines 35-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the system of **Thompson** as modified by **Chang**, **Eggen** and **Kikinis** with the teaching of **Greenlee** for the purpose of allowing the user to stop an alarm after they have been alerted in order to avoid disturbing the device user more than necessary.

***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q. Shang** whose telephone number is **571-272-7355**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-400pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher S. Kelley** can be reached on **571-272-7331**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic Business Center (EBC)** at **866-217-9197 (toll-free)**. If you would like assistance from a **USPTO Customer Service Representative** or access to the automated information system, call **800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA)** or **571-272-1000**.



**Annan Q. Shang**



**CHRIS KELLEY**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**